

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Johnnie Frazier,	)	C/A No.: 1:24-1124-CMC-SVH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER AND NOTICE
Captain M. Hunter; Lt. June; Lt.	)	
Mack; and Srg. Belton,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

Johnnie Frazier (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed this complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging violations of his constitutional rights by Captain M. Hunter, Lt. June, Lt. Mack, and Srg. Belton (collectively “Defendants”). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civ. Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e) (D.S.C.), the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the district judge.

#### I. Factual and Procedural Background

Plaintiff alleges Lt. Mack brought in poison about four months ago and also claims a white school teacher brought three grams of “carfintanal.”<sup>1</sup> In the

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, “Carfentanil is a synthetic opioid approximately 10,000 times more potent than morphine and 100 times more potent than fentanyl. . . .” <https://www.dea.gov/press-releases/2016/09/22/dea-issues-carfentanil-warning-police-and-public> (last visited March 11, 2024).

section on the form complaint for Plaintiff to provide the underlying facts of his claim, Plaintiff stated “They poisoned me June and Belton had bird bags and blo jobs out the ass.” [ECF No. 1 at 4]. He seeks \$200,000,000 in monetary damages and injunctive relief.

## II. Discussion

### A. Standard of Review

Plaintiff filed his complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss a case upon a finding that the action fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted or is frivolous or malicious. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). A claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989).

A complaint must contain “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Pro se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leekte*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). In evaluating a pro se complaint, the plaintiff’s allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v.*

*City of N.Y.*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2d Cir. 1975). The mandated liberal construction afforded to pro se pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so. A federal court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a pro se litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007).

The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts that set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, 390–91 (4th Cir. 1990). Although the court must liberally construe a pro se complaint, the United States Supreme Court has made it clear a plaintiff must do more than make conclusory statements to state a claim. See *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677–78 (2009); *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). Rather, the complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim that is plausible on its face, and the reviewing court need only accept as true the complaint's factual allegations, not its legal conclusions. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678–79.

## B. Analysis

### 1. Supervisory Liability for Captain Hunter

Plaintiff's complaint contains no factual allegations specific to Hunter. To the extent Hunter is sued only in his official capacity, Plaintiff has failed to

state a claim under § 1983. The doctrine of supervisory liability is generally inapplicable to § 1983 suits, such that an employer or supervisor is not liable for the acts of his employees, absent an official policy or custom that results in illegal action. *See Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978); *Fisher v. Washington Metro. Area Transit Authority*, 690 F.2d 1133, 1142–43 (4th Cir. 1982). The Supreme Court explains that “[b]ecause vicarious liability is inapplicable to *Bivens* and § 1983 suits, a plaintiff must plead that each Government-official defendant, through the official’s own individual actions, has violated the Constitution.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 676; *see Slakan v. Porter*, 737 F.2d 368, 372–74 (4th Cir. 1984) (finding officials may be held liable for the acts of their subordinates, if the official is aware of a pervasive, unreasonable risk of harm from a specified source and fails to take corrective action as a result of deliberate indifference or tacit authorization). Accordingly, Hunter is subject to summary dismissal.

## 2. Insufficient Allegations

Although Plaintiff alleges Mack, June, and/or Belton poisoned him, he does not state why he believes he was poisoned, such as physical effects from the alleged poisoning. Further, he does not allege any facts advising how he knows Mack, June, and/or Belton are responsible for the alleged poisoning. Although the court must liberally construe a pro se complaint, the United States Supreme Court has made it clear a plaintiff must do more than make

conclusory statements to state a claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677–78 (2009); *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). Rather, the complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim that is plausible on its face, and the reviewing court need only accept as true the complaint’s factual allegations, not its legal conclusions. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678–79. Here, Plaintiff has not alleged sufficient facts to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

**NOTICE CONCERNING AMENDMENT**

Plaintiff may attempt to correct the defects in his complaint by filing an amended complaint by **April 2, 2024**, along with any appropriate service documents. Plaintiff is reminded an amended complaint replaces the original complaint and should be complete in itself. *See Young v. City of Mount Ranier*, 238 F.3d 567, 572 (4th Cir. 2001) (“As a general rule, an amended pleading ordinarily supersedes the original and renders it of no legal effect.”) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). If Plaintiff files an amended complaint, the undersigned will conduct screening of the amended complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. If Plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint or fails to cure the deficiencies identified above, the undersigned will recommend to the district court that the claims be dismissed without leave for further amendment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 12, 2024  
Columbia, South Carolina



Shiva V. Hodges  
United States Magistrate Judge